

Remarks

This Response is filed together with a Request for Continued Examination. The Request for Continued Examination requests that the previous Response mailed March 14, 2008 be entered into the official file, thereby facilitating entry of the amendments made in this Response.

Claims 1, 6, 19 and 20 are currently pending. Claims 1, 6 and 19 are currently amended. Claims 2 and 5 were cancelled and Claims 3, 4, 26 and 27 are currently cancelled. Claims 7, 18 and 21-25 were withdrawn.

Claims 3, 4, 26 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite. As noted above, those claims have now been cancelled, thereby rendering the rejection moot. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Surmacz. The Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's helpful comments with respect to SEQ ID NO: 28 in particular. The Applicant respectfully submits that Surmacz is inapplicable for the reasons set forth below.

First, Claim 3 has been cancelled, thereby rendering that portion of the rejection moot. On the other hand, Claim 1 has been amended to recite SEQ ID NO: 3. Surmacz does not disclose an antisense of IRS-1 having a sequence corresponding to SEQ ID NO: 3. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by Wolf. The Applicant again notes with appreciation the Examiner's helpful comments with respect to Wolf and the various SEQ ID NOs. However, Wolf does not disclose an antisense of IRS-1 having a sequence corresponding to SEQ ID NO: 3. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Claims 1, 3 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over Surmacz, Nolan and Bennett. The Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's detailed and helpful comments with respect to the theoretical application of those publications against those claims. The Applicant nonetheless respectfully submits that all of Surmacz, Nolan and Bennett are inapplicable for the reasons set forth below.

First, the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is now moot with respect to cancelled Claim 3. With respect to Claims 1 and 6, the Applicant notes that none of Surmacz,

Nolan, Bennett and Wolf describes nor suggests an antisense oligonucleotide having for sequence SEQ ID NO: 3 and inhibiting angiogenesis. Consequently, all of Surmacz, Nolan and Bennett respectively fail to teach all of the elements of amended Claims 1 and 6. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Surmacz, Nolan and Bennett.

Claims 19 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 in view of the hypothetical combination of Wolf with Surmacz, Nolan and Bennett. The Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the combination is inapplicable to Claims 19 and 20. In that regard, all of the Surmacz, Nolan, Bennett and Wolf fail to describe or suggest an antisense oligonucleotide having a SEQ ID NO: 3 and inhibiting angiogenesis. As a consequence, even if one skilled in the art were to hypothetically combine Wolf with any or all of Surmacz, Nolan and Bennett, the resulting combination would still not produce the subject matter of the Applicant's Claims 19 and 20. Withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103 is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that the entire Application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for Applicant

TDC/vbm
(215) 656-3381